# A DISCOURSE,

SHEWING

That it is Lawfull, and our Duty

To ſwear OBEDIENCE to

# KING William,

Notwithſtanding the Oath of ALLEGIANCE taken to the

## LATE KING.

By a Divine in the North.

*LONDON*,

Printed, and ſold by *R. Baldwin*, in the *Old Bayly*. 1689.

6.

TO THE

Renownedly Learned and Reverend

# GILBERT BURNET, D.D.

Lord BISHOP of *SARUM.*

Reverend Sir,

*MY Zeal for this preſent Government, (the happieſt Change that ever Nation was bleſt with,) and my Trouble to ſee ſome remaining Scruples, which (in deſpight of all God's manifeſtations to us) ſeem yet to diſturb our* Iſrael, *have ſo far tranſported me beyond the bounds of Modeſty, and made me forget my own Weakneſs, as to thruſt upon you this unworthy Pamphlet.*

*My Forwardneſs for the Cauſe had wellnigh put me upon the printing of it without farther conſultation; but upon ſecond thoughts I judg'd it ſafer in a matter, of this weight, to conſult ſome of greater Learning: And whilſt my thoughts were roving to find out ſome proper perſons, (of which, upon ſeveral accounts, there are but few in this quarter of our World,) attracted with the fame of Your Worth, and Learning, and the ſenſe of Your*

*great Actings in our happy Change it ſelf, they ſeemed to bend to Tou-wards. And though a perſon of leſs Buſineſs, and leſs Note, might very well have ſerved to examine ſo pitifull a Piece, yet promiſing my ſelf better uſage from You, whoſe Candour muſt be anſwerable to Your Greatneſs, than perhaps I might meet with from ſome of leſſer note, I reſolved, however bold it might appear in me, to take this way. Accept therefore, Reverend Sir, this poor Piece, which however rude it be, if it be but ſound I care not: And though it was very fond of the journey, to come and preſent it ſelf to You, yet it will, upon the approach of ſo grave a Cenſure, (methinks) begin to tremble. And if I be prevented by any other who (queſtionleſs) may doe it better, I am very well pleaſed with the Service which may be done to my Sovereigns by it, and think my ſelf ſufficiently rewarded for my poor Endeavours, that I had the Honour of expreſſing to You my readineſs in them. God preſerve You, Reverend Sir, and enrich his Church more and more with ſuch noble Patriots.*

A Diſ-

# A DISCOURSE,

SHEWING

That it is Lawfull, and our Duty

To ſwear OBEDIENCE to

# KING William,

Notwithſtanding the Oath of ALLEGIANCE taken to the late King.

AMong the many Scruples of Conſcience, which have riſen from this turn of Times, the greateſt, in my opinion, and (I hope) the laſt is this: Whether or no it be lawfull for thoſe, who have ſworn Allegiance to the late King, to take this new Oath of Allegiance to King *William*.

This is the great Scruple which, I find, cannot eaſily be ſhaken off by men even of greateſt Learning, and greateſt Integrity; and if men could but once clear themſelves of this, I hope, there will remain no farther cauſe of Scruple.

And although I do not pretend to preſcribe Rules to others, who are wiſer and better than my ſelf, yet what I here write for my own ſatisfaction, may perhaps be ſomewhat ſatisfactory too to ſuch whoſe want of leaſure, or other lets, may hinder them from making enquiry into the thing themſelves.

Firſt then, There are two preliminary Queſtions neceſſary to be conſidered, in order to the reſolving this preſent Scruple.

The firſt is, Whether or no I can be any longer obliged to a man by Oath, or otherwiſe, when he himſelf is diveſted of that Power, in conſideration of which I was by Oath, or otherwiſe, obliged to him? And it is certain I cannot. The thing is ſo common, and clear, that it needs not much proving, there being daily inſtances of the thing: For though a man is obliged

liged to a Lord of a Manour, a Magiſtrate, or Maſter, ſo long as they are ſuch, yet when they once ceaſe to be ſuch, and are ſuperſeded by Oaths, my Obligation, how ſtrong ſoever, doth then ceaſe, and I may a-new be obliged to the Succeeder.

The next Queſtion is, Who is to be owned as ſupreme? He who was once our lawfull King, or he who by Force, or otherwiſe, hath dethroned this King, and is himſelf ſeated upon the Throne?

And in my opionion, the laſt is ſupreme; for the bearing of the Sword is ſo inſeparable from the ſupreme Power, that the very Life of Supremacy conſiſts in it; and it is as improper to call him King who wants Power, as to call him a man, who wants Reaſon.

A King is ſet over a People by God, as his Vice-gerent, and endued with Power ſufficient to encourage and defend the righteous, and puniſh the wicked; but when God takes from him all Power, ſo that he can neither doe the one, nor the other, How can he be called

God's Vice-gerent, and Supreme ? Is not he rather to be called ſo, and to be look'd upon to be ſuch, upon whom God hath transferr'd this Power ?

And as he who is lawfully ejected can no longer lay any Claim to that Eſtate out of which he is ejected, but he is to be owned as Lord, who is lawfully poſſeſt of it ; ſo when God, who hath the ſole Diſpoſal of Crowns, and may give them to whom he pleaſes, doth diſpoſſeſs a King of a Crown,and puts another in his place,we are then to acquieſce. It's true,whilſt the thing is in diſpute, it is the part of every honeſt man, to ſtand up for his King as much as he can, but when once the buſineſs is ended, and actuall Poſſeſſion given, (which could never be without God's *Fiat*, who himſelf is the Judg of Kings, and putteth down one, and ſetteth up another,) there is then no farther Appeal to be made, or Writ of Errour brought, unleſs we think we are higher than God, and have a better Right to diſpoſe of Crowns then he; we are therefore to own him as ſupreme, whom God hath ſet up, and not obſtinately to ſtand out for him who is actually diſpoſſeſt.

Again :

Again: Since the Tribute, and Revenues of a Crown are the Stipend of God, (if I may call it ſo,) appropriated by God to the ſupreme Powers, as his Miniſters, it being neceſſary for the ſupport of their Grandeur, and Carrying on of their Buſineſs, and therefore, St. *Paul* ſaith, They are God's Miniſters attending continually upon this very thing: When then this Tribute is quite taken from one, and given to another, ſo that it is impoſſible for him from whom it is taken to appear any longer as the Miniſter of God, and carry on his Buſineſs, God then ſeems to me to have actually diſcharged ſuch an one from his Service, and to have pitcht upon the other to be his Miniſter, to whom the Tribute is paid: And therefore it ſeems clear to me, that he is to be owned as Supreme, and God's Miniſter, who actually poſſeſſeth the Throne, and the Appurtenances thereof; and not he who was once King but is now diſpoſſeſt:

As for that nice Diſtinction of a King *de jure*, and a King *de facto*, I look upon it to be a mere *Chimæra*, and no way practicable. A man cannot ſerve two Maſters, as our Saviour ſaith: We muſt ſuppoſe this King *de jure* to be a King, and

and if he be a King, he muſt be acknowledged for ſuch, and have all the Honour and Service paid him which is due to a King.

Again: The King *de facto* muſt be acknowledged too to be a King, and being ſo, muſt be honoured and ſerved as a King; now what can a man doe in this caſe? If he ſerve the one he muſt neglect the other, if he cleave to the one, he muſt forſake the other; he cannot ſerve them both, they both laying Claim to the ſame Services. Since then it is impoſſible to ſerve them both, there can be no ſuch thing in Nature as two Kings, a King *de jure*, and a King *de facto*; for we know that Nature deſigns an End to all her Actions, but there can be no ſuch Action where the End is impoſſible: The Query is then, Since there muſt be but one King, which of the two is he? The King *de jure*, or the King *de facto*? It is certain the laſt is he.

My Argument is this: Affairs cannot be managed by Fancy, and Suppoſitions; there muſt be acting in the caſe: Now a King *de jure* is only an empty Title, and cannot act, the whole

Power

Power of Acting being in the King *de facto*; and therefore unleſs you think you can live upon mere Notions, you muſt of neceſſity have recourſe to the King *de facto*, and own him as Supreme, ſince he is only in a capacity to act.

And whereas it is ſaid, That the Crown cannot be forfeited, and that therefore a King whilſt he lives can never ceaſe to be King; *Once King, and allways King.* To this I anſwer: Grant that it cannot legally be forfeited, and that though the Law obliges the King, yet it cannot puniſh him; and that the Law hath ſo fenced about the Perſons of Kings, that it is impoſſible in the ſenſe of the Law, for a King upon any Treſpaſs whatever to forfeit his Crown; and that there is no Subject can offer any Violence, or attempt any thing againſt the Prerogative or Perſon of the King, but at the ſame time he becomes a Treſpaſſer of the Law, and by the Law is puniſhable; grant all this I ſay, that the Laws of the Land do, as much as they can, ſecure the Right of Dominion in the Perſon of a King, and his Succeſſors, ſo that as far as they can make him, he is King *de jure*; yet

*jure*

*jure* they can never make him ſo abſolute, but that God hath ſtill a Right above him, and Power to depoſe him; and whenever he doth it, the Right, and Power, which were by Law deriv'd, or ſecur'd to that King, muſt then ceaſe, and be null: And therefore (in my opinion) let ſuch a King, and his Abetters pretend to what they will, and lay Claim to the Crown as much as they pleaſe, by virtue of this and the other Conſtitution of Government, yet ſuch Claim is quite out of doors, when there is another King *de facto*; and the King *de facto* is King *de jure*, and claims under a far greater Right; for it is *Jure divino* that Kings reign, but it is only *Jure humano* that they are hereditary, or elective, that there is this or the other ſort of Government. It is certain therefore, that though it be granted, that the Crown cannot legally be forfeited, yet it may be otherwiſe loſt, and ſeized on; God may make a Forfeiture of it, and diſpoſe of it to whom he pleaſes; otherwiſe there can be no Conquerour in the World can have any Right to the Crown, which he conquers.

But

But you will ſay, A Conqueror is one thing, and an Uſurper is another; you will own a Conquerour to be ſupreme, even when the conquered King is living; but you will not own an Uſurper to be ſo: And thus (I know) many will talk, but (if I may be ſo bold as to ſay ſo) it's juſt at random, never knowing, nor weighing what Reaſon there may be for the one more than the other: But I am reſolved, with the little Wit I have, to pauſe upon things better, before I ſwallow them down ſo inconſiderately. Let us then compare the Conquerour and Uſurper together, and ſee wherein the Excellency of the one lies above the other.

And firſt then, Grant that ſome Conquerours have at firſt been on the defenſive ſide, and have had juſt Cauſe of War, yet they were not ſo juſt to give over, when they have got ſufficient Reparations; but being heartened with Succeſs, would admit of no Terms, but went ſtill on, till they had ruin'd their nighbouring Prince: This (I am ſure) was neither juſt, nor lawfull; and yet, being Conquerours, their Supremacy is owned: But

where there is one who at firſt hath had juſt Cauſe of War, there are many of them for this one who had not, but invaded their Nighbours purely out of Ambition, and a deſire to enlarge their Dominions: This ſurely was unjuſt, and yet their Supremacy is owned. I ask then, What is the cauſe why we may lawfully own their Supremacy? Is it the unlawfullneſs of their War? No ſure; that cannot be it. What can it be then? Truly nothing elſe, but becauſe they prov'd victorious, and poſſeſt themſelves of the Throne. Now then, if a Conquerour is to be owned as Supreme becauſe he is poſſeſt of the Throne, though his War was illegal; I ask, Why an Uſurper is not to be owned as Supreme, when poſſeſt of the Throne, though he too came illegally to it?

It's true, you may ſay, you look not upon an illegal War to be ſo heinous as Rebellion; I grant it; but yet I look upon them both to be unlawfull Means of coming to a Crown.

The

The truth of it is, though the Lord cannot be the Authour of the Evil of Sin, yet he is the Authour of the Evil of Puniſhment. *Can there be evil in the City,* (ſaith *Amos,*) *and the Lord hath not done it?* And God, in whoſe Power alone it is to puniſh Kings, may puniſh them as well by the Hand of a Rebel, as an Invader. We have ſo many inſtances of this, and thoſe ſo clearly owned by God too, that it is not to be queſtioned; and he hath too as clearly owned theſe very men to be ſet up by him, and to be his Kings, who (though they had no good deſign of their own in it) were yet deſigned by him, for the Puniſhment of thoſe other Kings whom they diſpoſſeſt. And when they are thus ſet up, ſurely they are Supreme, and are to be owned as ſuch, unleſs we will prove Θεόμαχοι, and fight againſt God. And therefore, if we firſt have recourſe to examples taken out of the Scriptures of the Old Teſtament, we ſhall find, that though Rebells (for ſuch they were, when they did it without a ſpecial Commiſſion from God) did riſe up, and kill their Kings, and poſſeſs their Thrones, that the People were yet ſubject unto them; and they are liſted among the other King's,

and their Reigns ſet down as Kings in the ſacred Cronicle, but (it's true) with the infamous addition too of the Treaſon which they wrought. And when it pleaſed God that they ſhould be ſerv'd in the ſame kind, yet (of ſo ſanctifying a nature is the Enjoyment of the Crown) even the perſons of thoſe Uſurpers were by it accounted ſo ſacred, that even they who rebelled againſt them, following their example, are by the Holy Ghoſt branded for Traitors, and puniſh'd accordingly. I ſhall for brevity ſake referr you to the Scripture it ſelf, where you ſhall find Examples of this in many, if not in moſt of the Kings of *Iſrael*.

But to deal fairly, as one who is not wedded to his opinion, but deſires to inform and be informed, there is one inſtance amongſt the Kings of *Iſrael* which ſeems to make againſt me; and it is that of *Zimri*, who killed *Elah*, and was himſelf within ſeven days killed by *Omri*, whom all the People of *Iſrael* aſſiſted. But we muſt conſider, that he was not ſeated upon the Throne of the Kingdom, but reigned only in one City, namely, *Tirzah*,

*Tirzah*, all the reſt of the Kingdom diſowning him.

But there is another Example amongſt the Kings of *Judah*, which ſeems to make much more againſt me, and to be the very Caſe in hand. *Athaliah*, the Queen-Mother, her Son *Ahaziah*, King of *Judah*, being dead, aroſe, and deſtroyed all the Seed Royal, and poſſeſt her ſelf of the Throne, and reigned ſeven Years, (a conſiderable time to have ended all Diſputes, if the Caſe had not been extraordinary;) *Jehoſhebah*, his Aunt, having ſaved *Joaſh*; the only Son of *Ahaziah* that was left unkill'd, hid him all that time; and then *Jehojadah* the Prieſt acquainting the chief Officers with it, brought him forth, where, with an unanimous conſent, he was forthwith proclaim'd; with the ſhouts of which proclamation, *Athaliah* being allarm'd, and incenſed, runs into the Temple, and ſeeing the young King upon the Throne, doth there in her own right, her ſelf being Herald, forthwith proclaim them Traitors, crying, *Treaſon, Treaſon*; but they were ſo far, from taking notice of any thing of a Claim which ſhe made to the Crown,

Crown, or of her Accuſation of Treaſon which ſhe laid againſt them, that, as *Jehojadah* had before ordered it, ſhe was forthwith taken out, and executed. And certainly either this inſtance or none will be able to make out, That Uſurpers, when ſeated upon the Throne, are yet to be depoſed, and the King *de jure* only to be owned. And I have the rather quoted this inſtance, becauſe I expect it may be inſtanced againſt me; and therefore reſolved throughly to diſcuſs it, as well for my own, as for the Satisfaction of others. But though it ſeems to make ſo much againſt me, and though I have ſet it out as much as I could, to the advantage of the contrary Opinion, yet I ſhall now ſhew wherein it falls ſhort, or rather indeed makes for my ſide.

And firſt, If we conſider who the perſon was, who was the main inſtrument of this Change, we ſhall find it to be *Jehojadah* the Prieſt, and we muſt needs think, that he being ſatisfied that the Child was preſerved alive, would in this grand Concern conſult the Oracle of God, to which he might have recourſe,

courſe, and the conſulting of which was his Office. Again, We have the grounds upon which he and the People proceeded to this Change clearly ſet down, 2. *Chro.* 23. 3. it was an Oracle delivered by God to *David*, that there ſhould allways be a Male of his Seed, to ſit upon his Throne; they therefore taking this Promiſe of God to *David* as an infallable Truth, and finding accordingly, that beyond all expectations there was a Male Child preſerv'd of that Line, they therefore waving all other obligations, did ſtick to this Divine Oracle: So that the Caſe is vaſtly different from any thing that could have happened ſince, they then having God's ſpecial directions in the thing; and this Child (as were all the Kings of *Judah*) being a King *de jure* indeed, but of ſuch a *jure*, that never King in the World, ſince our *Shiloh* came, can lay claim to the like; for if it had been only ſuch a *Jus*, as our Kings have to the Crown, they might as well at firſt have ſtood up againſt the Uſurpers in behalf of *Jehoſheba*, to whom (according to the tenure of bare Succeſſion) the Right of the Crown did devolve, after the ſlaughter of her Nephews. But this

they did not. And here leſt I overſlipt it, I muſt (however out of order) take notice of a very remarkable Point, which is this: That the People offer'd not to ſtirr (which I ſhall preſently prove) in defence of the Succeſſion againſt *Athaliah*, who was poſſeſt of the Throne; nay, though *Jehoſheba*, who by Succeſſion was the right Heireſs to the Crown, was alive: And this may ſerve to ſatisfy thoſe men, who are ſo ſtiff, that they will not own the King *de facto*, whilſt the King *de jure* (as they term him) is alive.

And now I am to make out, that this inſtance makes more for my opinion, than the contrary.

It is recorded, that *Athaliah* reigned all thoſe ſeven years, till it came to light that the Child was preſerved; and if ſhe reigned, it muſt be granted, that ſhe had the ſame Power, as well over Prieſt as People, which the Kings of *Judah* had; and we never read that *Jehojadah*, or any other, were before diſobedient to Her, till it was known that there was a Male-Heir, who by the particular direction

of

of God was to reign. And it muſt be preſumed, that they would ſtill have own'd her as Supreme, if this had not come to light, though ſhe came to the Crown by moſt Illegal and Bloudy means; for it cannot be ſuppoſed that *Jehojadah* knew any thing of the firſt hiding of the Child; and therefore might from the very firſt be diſobedient to her; for it would have been unſafe to have conceal'd it ſo long: And it cannot be ſaid that he expected a more fit time to publiſh it, when the Child ſhould be of diſcretion to govern; for even when he was crown'd, he was but ſeven years old, which (I am ſure) are not years of diſcretion: It follows therefore, that *Jehojadah* knew nothing of it; and therefore muſt be preſum'd till then, to have liv'd in ſubjection to *Athaliah*, as ſupreme. And now I leave it to the World to judg, whether this inſtance (however it might ſeem at firſt to make againſt me) doth not make more for me, than for thoſe who are of a contrary Opinion.

The next thing then that we muſt have recourſe to, is the Practice of the Primitive

Chriſtians; and I dare challenge any man to tell me, which of them in all thoſe many Revolutions of Affairs, when the ſucceeding Emperours were allways by indirect means ſupplanting their Predeceſſors; Which of them (I ſay) did ever deny Subjection to the Emperour in being, however unlawfully he came to the Throne? Nay, I ſhall give you an inſtance to the quite contrary. *Philippus Bardas* was Emperour, and (if we believe *Euſebius*) was Baptiz'd, and a Chriſtian, and therefore muſt certainly be mightily endear'd to the Chriſtians, who never before had any Emperour of their Perſuaſion, but Emperours who moſt of them did perſecute them in moſt cruel manner. Now certainly, the loſs of this Emperour would trouble and offend them, and render them (if ever) diſaffected to the Government of the ſucceeding Emperour *Decius*, who depos'd him, and murthered him; yet for all this, ſo far were they from diſowning the preſent Emperour, who yet came ſo unworthily to the Throne, that they thought it their duty to pray for him, and not only for him, but afterwards for *Gallus*, who ſucceeded him, and was in every

reſpect as bad as he. *He chaſed away* (ſaith *Dionyſius*, Biſhop of *Alexandria*, in his Letter to *Hermammon*) *the Holy men which pray'd for Peace, and his proſperous ſtate, and ſo together with them he baniſhed the Prayers continually poured unto God for him.* Euſ. l. 7. c. 1.

And ſurely we cannot think that thoſe undaunted Champions of Chriſtianity could, to ſave themſelves, be in the leaſt guilty of any Flattery, or idle Complement; no ſure; but this they did, being thereunto oblig'd by the Holy Scriptures, wherein we are commanded to pray for Kings, that we may lead a quiet, and godly life under them; and ſurely we have ſtill greater reaſon to pray thus for the worſt of Kings, becauſe they are in greateſt danger of being diſturbed, and diſturbing other.

And if indeed the Practice of thoſe primitive Chriſtians had been ſuch as to diſown their Authority, and ſeek to diſturb them, and yet at the ſame time to pray for their peaceable Reign, their Prayers, and Practice

being ſo diametrically oppoſite, they would certainly have been lookt upon, (and that juſtly too) as the worſt of men, and no way to be truſted.

And though the blaſphemous Complement of *Boniface* to *Phocus* was more than Flattery, and an eſpouſing of his barbarous way of acceſſion to the Crown; yet if he had only been ſubject to him, and prav'd for him, when ſeated upon the Imperial Throne, he had done no more than all good Chriſtians then did, and might lawfully doe.

Honeſt St. *Martin* did much better, who drinking to his Deacon, and not to the Emperour, let him ſee (though indeed too haughtily, rarely, and publickly, not like a Courtier, nay, not a prudent Biſhop, whoſe likelier way to work upon the Emperour had been to have reprov'd him deliberately, calmly, and privately, this other being the ready way to have diſobligʼd, and quite loſt him) let him ſee (I ſay) that his unjuſt way of coming to the Crown, was diſpleaſing to God, and did deſerve his Fatherly Correption, and Penance.

Now

Now this was all that he did, and this is that which every Ghostly Father of a King ought, and may doe, to admonish him of his sins, and yet at the same time own his Supremacy.

And I look upon him, who, in those great Debates here in *England* betwixt the Houses of *Lancaster* and *York* about the Crown, did live peaceably under that King that was possest of the Throne, to have been far the better Subject, and better Christian, than he whose turbulent Spirit was still for Change, and was the occasion of so much War, and Bloudshed.

And thus I have made it out, that not only a Conquerour, but an Usurper is to be owned as Supreme, and to be set up by God, when possest of the Throne.

But then the Query is, how far he must be possest of the Throne, that we may acknowledge him set up by God, and desist from any farther opposition.

It's

It's true, we have no ſuch Revelations now as were in the times of the old Teſtament, and therefore may ſtill be at a ſtand, when ſuch Kings are fully ſet up by God; yet, if I may ſpend my weak judgment upon it, I look upon a King to be thus ſet up, when the former King, and his Heirs, being either baniſh'd, kill'd, or impriſon'd, the other is ſeated upon the Throne; and ſo far, either for fear or favour, own'd by the Nation, that there is wholly a Ceſſation of Arms, or a very inconſiderable Oppoſition made.

And if God hath the ſame Power ſtill (which to queſtion were Blaſphemy) to pull down and ſet up Kings when he pleaſes; and yet ſince we cannot expect any Revelation from him, when he does it; either this Rule which I have here mentioned is the only way to know it, or elſe I would gladly know what other Rule we have to know it by.

But here it will be objected, That if Poſſeſſion gives Right, the Law muſt be quite laid aſide; and he that hath the ſtrongeſt Arm will have the greateſt Right; and ſo this

Doctrine

Doctrine will be an Inlet to all Oppreſſion and Violence.

To this I anſwer, That grant a King cannot be puniſh'd, and diſpoſſeſt by due courſe of Law, and that therefore God (if I may ſay ſo) is forc'd for the puniſhing and diſpoſſeſſing of Kings to uſe extraordinary means, which may tantamount to a Law; yet ſure the Law is ſufficient to take cogniſance of Subjects, to puniſh them, and redreſs their Grievances one to another; and therefore they need not, and ought not to take theſe extraordinary means, which God ſees often fit only and neceſſary for the puniſhing and diſpoſſeſſing of Kings.

But of ſo intricate a nature is the Matter in hand, that I have ſcarce unravelled one doubt, when preſently there ariſes another.

At this rate (ſay you) even a good King (inſtance King *Charles* the Martyr) may be deſtroyed by an Uſurper, and yet the Uſurper is not to be queſtioned, but own'd as Supreme: Certainly God never intended to deſtroy a good King ſo; and therefore if an Uſurper deſtroy

destroy such a King, he cannot be of God's setting up, and therefore is not to be owned as Supreme.

To this I answer, That I cannot without sorrow reflect upon the horrid Murther of that gracious Monarch, a Prince of unspotted Integrity, who was certainly the best of Kings, who for his Piety of Life might rid with the strictest Votaries, and for the manner of his Death, with the most famed Martyrs; and so far was he from bringing a Curse either upon the Nation, or himself, by any Sin of his own, that if ever the Goodness of a King could attone for the Sins of his People, his certainly could have done it. But it is not allways the sin of a King, which is the cause of such Overturnings, but very often indeed the sins of the People; though (God knows) we are too apt to lay the blame off our selves, and slander the Lord's anointed. And this happens according to *Samuel*'s Menace to the People, that if they should doe wickedly, they should be destroy'd both they, and their King. God is many times pleased for the Punishment of a sinfull People to remove good Kings from them,

them, and to set Tyrants in their Place; and then even those Tyrants are of God's setting up, and are therefore to be owned as Supreme, and obey'd, as long as God pleases to continue them over us.

But here I am afresh assaulted with another Objection, so hard it is to struggle through this difficult Case. What! (say you) God is pleased to work by Means, (Miracles are now ceased;) and therefore, if we our selves put not to our Hands, to pull down such Usurpers, but fondly own them still to be Supreme, and therefore not to be resisted, we may long look before we be delivered, and perhaps may offend God by slipping those Opportunities, which may seem for that purpose to be put into our Hands.

But to this I answer, That God, who hath the Power of Life and Death, is not so unprepar'd of Instruments of Death, as for want of others, to make allways use of one. He hath a store house (as I may say) of Accidents, and Diseases, out of which he may chuse any one sufficient to put a Period to the days of the

greateſt Monarch; he can kill a King as ſoon by a Fever, as ſuffer a Rebel to kill him: And therefore though *David* knew that *Saul* was to be unking'd; nay, and that he too was to ſucceed, yet ſo far was he from being of *Abiſhai*'s Opinion, that then was the opportunity to kill him, and that then God had delivered him into his hands, when they found him aſleep, with the Spear at his Head, ſo far (I ſay) was he from being of his Opinion, and taking this opportunity, that he would neither doe it himſelf, nor ſuffer him to doe it; but piouſly, and prudently, told *Abiſhai*, that God had means of his own to doe it by, and needed not to be beholden to them to doe it by ſuch illegal Means; and therefore they were to expect his leaſure. *As the Lord liveth* (ſaith he) *the Lord ſhall ſmite him, or his day ſhall come to dye, or he ſhall deſcend into the Battel, and periſh. The Lord forbid that I ſhould ſtretch forth my hand againſt the Lord's Anointed*; and therefore let no Rebel think, that becauſe God hath a mind to put down a King, that yet he ſhall be the leſs guilty, who ſtretcheth forth his Hand to doe it.

And now I have with what ſcrutiny I can diſcuſt theſe two Preliminary Queries: In the anſwering the firſt of which there was little difficulty, it being a generally receiv'd Maxim, and Warrantable by the daily Practice of all ſorts of People: The main Difficulty lies in the Second, which I think I have removed, to my own, if not to the ſatisfaction of others; and have made it out, both by Reaſons, and Examples, (and at the ſame time remov'd all the Objections, that might make againſt it,) that he is not King and Supreme, who was once King, but is depos'd; but he is Supreme, who is actually in Power, and poſſeſt of the Throne.

And now let us take an eſtimate of our preſent Affairs, by what hath been here ſaid.

It is certain, never Prince had juſter Grounds of War, than this Prince had.

Firſt, In reſpect of the true Religion which was groaning under the growing Tyranny of the Church of *Rome*: We had a King ſo bigotted to Popery, that for it's Propagation, he queſtion'd not to break all that was moſt bin-

ding, all Promiſes of his own, and the Laws of the Land, which he ſwore to maintain; ſo that he may very well be rank'd amongſt thoſe Kings, whoſe ſaying is, *Let us break their bands aſunder, and caſt away their Cords from us.* But let me not Reflect too much upon a Perſon, who is yet upon ſeveral accounts to be reſpected by us, let us rather admire the Goodneſs of God, who hath ſent this Prince, as another *Conſtantine*, to deliver us from theſe impending ruines; for we may well ſay, *If the Lord had not ſent us this Deliverer, they had ſwallowed us up alive, when they were ſo wrathfully diſpleaſed at us.*

Secondly, He had juſt Cauſe of War to defend his own Right, which the adverſe Party laboured to debar him of: There was little good intended him, when Strangers, Papiſts, and Jeſuits, his profeſt Enemies were ſet to manage Affairs, and were acquainted with all the Intrigues of Court; and yet neither he, nor any for him were in the leaſt concerned, or taken any notice of. And when their young Prince was to be born, they did ſo induſtriouſly conceal all things from him, that they

they might as well have sent him word, that they intended to cheat him. He had just Cause therefore to vindicate himself, and his Right, from the abuses of such insolent Court-Parasites, and Impostors. And though it is true, he could claim no right by way of Succession, as long as his Father liv'd, yet, as a Forcign Prince, he might seek satisfaction for the Affront, which was put upon him, by such underhand, and illegal Dealings.

Thirdly, As the Cause of his War was just, so the Succes was thereunto answerable. Never Prince was in an Undertaking more apparently favour'd by Heaven. But it were needless for me to enlarge upon all the happy Occurences of this Expedition, since the Learned Dr. *Burnet*, who was an Eye-Witness of them all, hath allready done it in his Sermon, which is allmost in every man's hand, and therefore I refer you to it.

This I will only say, That never King came to a Crown with less Bloud-shed, with greater Applause, and Satisfaction of the People: And therefore since (as I have made it appear) even

those

those who come illegally to a Crown, are yet, when fully posseſt of it, to be own'd as Supreme; certainly King *William*, whose Cause of War was so just, and so miraculously victorious, and whose Proclamation over the whole Kingdom was so joyous to all, that in all Places where it was read, it may very well be said, *The shout of a King was among them*; certianly (I say) he is Supreme, he is of God's setting up.

And then it must needs follow, that if he be Supreme, the late King is not; for there cannot be two Supremes: And then it will follow again, that the Oath of Allegiance, and Supremacy, which we took to the other King, is now quite out of doors, all Supremacy, which was the ground of these Oaths, being now quite lost in the late King.

And then lastly, it will follow, That since King *William* is Supreme, we are in duty bound to pay him all that Honour, and Service, which is due to a Supreme; and then since swearing of Allegiance hath allways been own'd as due to the Supreme Power from the

the Subject, it is our Duty, when put upon it, to ſwear Allegiance to him too: And therefore (if I may be ſo bold to ſay ſo) I look upon it as an Errour in any (to ſay no worſe of it) who refuſe to doe it: As for my own part, as I have allways been Obedient to my Supreme, ſo I ſhall allways be Obedient to to King *William*, and Queen *Mary*, whoſe Supremacy over us I pray God long to continue.

---

*FINIS.*

---